Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/587,445	RAMSAUER, DIETER	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	EMILY M. MORGAN	3677			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED <u>24 June 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP		-			
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance w	Appeal. To avoid abar ., or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request		
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.				
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FIL	n. LED WITHIN TWO		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of the corresponding a	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as		
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	031160		
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	sideration and/or search (see NOT		cause		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	er form for appeal by materially rec	lucing or simplifying th	ne issues for		
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orrosponding number of finally roig	estad alaims			
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1 ⁻²		cted ciaims.			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	, ,,	mnliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324)		
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		inplication (i	102 02 1).		
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	t canceling the		
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of		
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>30,31,34-36,42,53 and 54</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 					
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ll and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a		
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.		
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:		
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☑ Other: Interview Summary attached.	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)				
/VICTOR BATSON/					
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3677					
.,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,					

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendment filed 1/14/2010 included claim language of undesignated parts "flat pieces". Examiner made an assumption as stated in the final action 3/17/2010. The amendment changes the assumption made by the examiner, and hence the amendment filed 6/24/2010 raises new issues.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Since the "flat pieces" of amended claim 30 were not designated in the figures as of the final rejection 3/17, examiner had to make an educated assumption as to what the flat metal pieces were in order to write the final. Claim 30 states that "holding elements which project in a resilient manner". Applicant has disclosed many "holding elements", and only holding elements 536 in figure 11b [0096] where disclosed in both figure and specification. Based on the figure, examiner concluded by the figure that they are in a similar orientation as those in reference Young. Since applicant had not disclosed the holding elements as "flat pieces" in any of the elected drawings or correlating specification, examiner was forced to conclude the arrangement of the flat pieces in an embodiment not elected. Applicant's drawing amendment discloses that the flat pieces are present in the elected embodiment figures 19a-h as 1136. Because this defines the part and alters examiner's assumption, this raises new issues. Examiner is also wary of the amendment because in the specification as originally filed, corresponding paragraphs [0103] and [0104] do not disclose that these are embodiments of the holding elements. Since this amendment drastically changes the interpretation of the holding element and the comprising parts, the amendment raises new issues. Regarding the art rejection, since examiner had made her assumption clear based on the specification and the drawings, and based the rejection on this assumption. Applicant contends that the two flat pieces of Young do not touch, however examiner stated that they are formed and used in the same configuration as assumed in figure 11b. The amendment now discloses the parts, and this requires further search and consideration.